### Renée E. Rothauge, OSB #903712

ReneeRothauge@markowitzherbold.com MARKOWITZ HERBOLD PC Suite 3000, Pacwest Center 1211 SW Fifth Avenue Portland, OR 97204-3730

Telephone: (503) 295-3085 Fax: (503) 323-9105

Michael J. Summersgill (pro hac vice)

Jordan L. Hirsch (pro hac vice)
Sean K. Thompson (pro hac vice)
WILMERHALE LLP
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
(617) 526-6000

**Grant K. Rowan** (pro hac vice)

WILMERHALE LLP 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20006 (202) 663-6000

**Arthur W. Coviello** (pro hac vice)

WILMERHALE LLP 950 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304 (650) 858-6000

Attorneys for Defendant Intel Corporation

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON PORTLAND DIVISION

**MEMORY INTEGRITY, LLC**, Case No. 3:15-cv-00262-SI

Plaintiff, DEFENDANT INTEL CORPORATION'S

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL EVIDENCE REGARDING CLAIM

CONSTRUCTION

INTEL CORPORATION,

v.

Defendant.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Pa	age
LR 7-1	l COMI	PLIANCE	1
I.	INTRO	ODUCTION	1
III.	DISCUSSION		1
	A.	"A Cache Access Request" ('409 Patent and '636 Patent)	2
	B.	"Remote Protocol Engine" / "Local Protocol Engine" / "One of" ('206 Patent a '254 Patent)	

#### LR 7-1 COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to LR 7-1, the parties have met and conferred regarding this Notice of Supplemental Evidence. During the meet and confer, Intel proposed that both sides have the opportunity to file short notices of supplemental evidence without argument in light of the October 30, 2015 deposition of Mr. David Glasco, a named inventor on all five asserted patents. MI opposes this submission and has refused Intel's offer to allow MI to file a similar notice of supplemental evidence without argument. MI instead has indicated that it will seek to file an additional claim construction brief with additional argument, which Intel opposes.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Claim construction briefing in this case was completed on October 28, 2015. (*See* Dkt. 87 [Scheduling Order].) However, David Glasco, one of the named inventors on all five of the asserted patents, was not available for deposition until two days later, on October 30. Intel took Mr. Glasco's deposition on October 30, and Mr. Glasco gave testimony that is relevant to several claim construction disputes between the parties. Intel respectfully submits this notice of supplemental evidence to bring this testimony to the Court's attention.

#### III. DISCUSSION

Mr. Glasco's deposition testimony is relevant to the parties' disputes with respect to several claim terms, including: (A) "a cache access request" and (B) the "remote protocol engine" / "local protocol engine" / "one of" terms.<sup>1</sup>

As discussed in Intel's opening and reply claim construction briefs (Dkt. 134 [Intel Opening Br.] at 20-21; Dkt. 151 [Intel Corr. Reply Br.] at 14), inventor testimony can be relevant to claim construction.

### A. "A Cache Access Request" ('409 Patent and '636 Patent)

Consistent with Intel's proposed construction of "a cache access request," and Intel's briefing on this claim term (*see* Dkt. 134 [Intel Opening Br.] at 24-26; Dkt. 151 [Intel Corr. Reply Br.] at 19-20), Mr. Glasco testified that a "cache access request" is different from a "probe":

- Q. Now, the patents describe the timing of sending and receiving probes and cache access request right?
- A. Right.

[Objection]

- Q. Is a probe the same as or different from a cache access request?[Objection]
- A. It's different.

\* \* \*

- Q. Okay. They're not the same, correct?
- A. Correct.

(Ex. 1 [Glasco Dep. Tr.] at 93:23-94:20.<sup>2</sup>)

# B. "Remote Protocol Engine" / "Local Protocol Engine" / "One of" ('206 Patent and '254 Patent)

Consistent with Intel's proposed construction of the "remote protocol engine" / "local protocol engine" / "one of" terms (*see* Dkt. 134, at 52-65; Dkt. 151, at 45-56), Mr. Glasco testified that the protocol engines of his invention process transactions targeting local or remote memory, but not both:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> "Ex. 1" refers to the exhibit attached to the Declaration of Arthur W. Coviello in Support of Intel Corporation's Notice of Supplemental Evidence Regarding Claim Construction.

Q. Would you agree that the remote protocol engines of the your 206 and 254 inventions handled transactions which targeted remote, as opposed to local, memory?

[Objection]

- A. Yes, given the definition of our remote protocol engines.
- Q. So the remote protocol engines that you came up with handled only remote memory transactions, right?
- A. Correct.

[Objection]

- Q. And would you agree that the [local] protocol engines of your 206 and 254 inventions handled transactions which targeted local, as opposed to remote, memory?
- A. Yes.

\* \* \*

- Q. So the local protocol engines of your idea handled only local memory transactions, correct?
- A. That was the design, yes.

\* \* \*

- Q. And so we could agree that in the system that is described in your 206, 254 patents, one protocol engine does not handle both remote and local memory transactions, right?
- A. Right. The remote protocol engines and the local protocol engines do not process both protocol flows.

(Ex. 1 at 76:19-78:22.)

DATED this 9th day of December 2015.

Grant K. Rowan (admitted pro hac vice) WILMERHALE LLP 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20006 (202) 663-6011 grant.rowan@wilmerhale.com

Arthur W. Coviello (admitted pro hac vice) WILMERHALE LLP 950 Page Mill Road Palo Alto, CA 94304 (650) 858-6000 arthur.coviello@wilmerhale.com

#### By:

/s/ Renée E. Rothauge Renée E. Rothauge (OSB #903712) MARKOWITZ HERBOLD PC 1211 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 3000 Portland, OR 97204-3730 (503) 295-3085

Michael J. Summersgill (admitted pro hac vice) Jordan L. Hirsch (admitted pro hac vice) Sean K. Thompson (admitted *pro hac vice*) WILMERHALE LLP 60 State Street Boston, MA 02109 (617) 526-6000 michael.summersgill@wilmerhale.com jordan.hirsch@wilmerhale.com sean.thompson@wilmerhale.com

Attorneys for Intel Corporation